DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 575 HE 010 659

AUTHOR Hutchinson, George
TITLE Faculty Development: A Conceptual Model.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented to the Teaching and Learning Council, San Diego State University ; George Hutchinson is Dean of the College of Professional Studies at San Diego State University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Decision Making; Educational Objectives; *Effective Teaching; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Humanistic Education; Professional Education; Student Centered Curriculum; *Student Teacher Relationship; Work Environment

ABSTRACT

The trend in faculty development seems to be to direct faculty efforts toward predetermined intellectual and social objectives, through predetermined faculty activities. This kind of faculty development has been divisive. A humanistic faculty development program should provide more real decisionmaking opportunities for faculty and students alike, and should provide opportunities for each faculty member to explore different ways of interacting with students and to test his own purposes and commitments. The crucial element in the environment provided for such professional development is respect and trust shared by faculty and students. This student-centered teaching is progressive, and yet is supportive of faculty work under present conditions, not directed toward unpredictable future conditions. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Denise Hutchinson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED162575

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: A CONCEPTUAL MODEL

INTRODUCTION

The Meaning of Faculty Development

Different questions about faculty must be raised when faculty reject the traditional assumptions that faculty development should be purposeful in terms of predetermined intellectual and social ends. I am assuming that faculty development programs should be centers which provide a varied and supportive environment for expanding each faculty's awareness and inquiry in the context of their present life. I believe that such an aesthetic and intellectual approach to the present is more desirable than attempting to shape faculty to some imagined future goal. Faculty development consistent with these assumptions takes place on two distinct but interrelated levels:

Level One: Educational faculty development takes place within the university and is concerned primarily with the quality of the environment and faculty learning.

Level Two: Accountability takes place primarily outside of the university and is concerned with whether the university and faculty within the university are moving toward mutually agreed-upon directions and purposes.

Differentiating these two levels of faculty development may help to clarify the distinction between faculty development in universities directed toward unpredictable and emerging goals and emerging goals and faculty development for accountability.

A Conceptual Model

For at least twenty years there has been a fundamental, widening split

HE 010 659

in the ranks of persons concerned with faculty development, a split that has profoundly affected trends in both theory and practice. The schism first became apparent when the so-called Art of Faculty Development in education began to emphasize content, minimum essentials and a reliance on instructional effectiveness (as it is sometimes called) came into direct conflict with the more traditional approaches which were embodied in the tenets of monolithic uniformity.

Whatever labels have been applied to the opposing factions of faculty development over the years, one may somewhat simplistically characterize the split by saying that one group emphasized a command of selected responses and a mastery of pre-determined content as a goal for faculty development. The other group saw a need for faculty to place greater stress on human development, self-realization, and social reconstruction as desirable ends. In fairness, one must recognize that each ideological camp sometimes presented the worst features of their opponents' ideas as typical of their proposals for instructional change.

My emphasis is on the conditions and the quality of the environment in which faculty development experiences develop rather than on pre-selection of faculty development activities to yield prespecified end products. A humanistic faculty development program should provide:

a. Real options for faculty and students alike. "Real options" means having choices, making decisions, and taking responsibility for the consequences of one's own activity.

b. Opportunities for each faculty to explore different ways of interacting as person and teacher; to experience him/herself as a growing person; to test and affirm his/her purposes and

commitments; to assume responsibility for making professional decisions consistent with his/her ethical commitments.

The crucial element of the projected faculty development environment is a relationship of mutual respect and trust shared by faculty and students. In any university the faculty serves as a model. He/she is looked to for intellectual leadership and attitudes about human beings and our culture. In my view, the faculty development programs must be active, caring and responsible to persons by demonstrating respect for the position they represent. The intellectually able faculty will communicate their excitement and joy in learning to their students. He/she will be able to take a stand, communicate a position, and permit the students to develop and validate their own points of view.

Most faculty development programs can be viewed as a start or stimulation for individual exploration and development. Substantive goals will emerge from individual interactions with and processing of data in the environment.

Traditional emphasis on the so-called "basic skills" for making it as an educator implies that these skills can be separated out both from the larger academic context in which they are to become operative and from the personal, holistic context of human development. In practice, basic skills have become the primary objectives of faculty development in our society. Such a skewed emphasis assumes that if these skills are not taught directly, systematically, intensively and extensively, either they will not be learned at all or there will be widespread inability for faculty to teach students to read, compute, and write.

However viewed, the prevailing approach to most faculty development programs have not been meeting their aims. Volumes of current critiques on

the status of faculty development attest to their failure. Yet, the fragmented forms on isolated teaching techniques are continued in new waves of intensive "teaching" that can only be terrorizing to the students and self-defeating in the long run.

The nature of the intellectual aspect of faculty development is a crucial concern to me. My focus, however, is holistic, reflecting the holistic conceptions and commitments. I believe that skills, both intellectual and social, are inextricably enmeshed in the cultural milieu and will be continuously developed by faculty as they learn to deal with ideas and decisions within the broad context of their environment.

In this view the task of faculty development is threefold:

a. To stimulate faculty awareness.

b. To respond to faculty's growing awareness with help, suggestions and resources, as appropriate.

c. To initiate suggestions and opportunities designed to stimulate and support faculty development in the areas they have selected.

The problem with faculty development is, in many ways, a question of how to "package" it so that faculty will participate. This statement is not as commercial or as crass as it sounds because as noted earlier, some form of faculty development will exist anyway and the real question is: in what manner will faculty and social conditions intervene to shape its effectiveness.

The traditional approach has been to begin with an analysis of the knowledge and skills necessary for faculty to function adequately, then break these down into manageable time units and adjust the specifics to the general capabilities of faculty at various levels. The subject matter is performed in terms of the faculty-organized bodies of knowledge and skills which are considered necessary for development within disciplines.

SUMMARY

Except for Ivan Illich's utopian desire to do away with schools altogether, there have been no proposal solutions to the problems of education in our society that do not fall into the category of faculty development. This article has addressed itself toward "progressive teaching" which means student-centered teaching: i.e. more emphasis on the freedom and independence of students.

It is exhilarating to work for reform of faculty development along these lines. As professors, we are trained to experience ourselves as an abstraction. Students and professors are often muffled from each other by their disembodied ideals. Although most of us cannot speak without revealing something of a nature of our social reality, we usually make much of it unavailable to students.

Most professors subscribe to the sacred concepts of academic neutrality and professional purity and see education as a value-free transfer of information. Faculty development programs should not ignore the fact that most faculty are not interested in growth for its own sake, but rather in growth which will make a positive contribution to life (according to a value system derived from specific circumstances).

This notion of this proposed faculty development program involves five notions, all of them in some regard upstanding:

1. A proper and effective answer to the injustice and to the devastation of the time in which we live that can be constituted by the individual and self-directed for love and satisfaction;
2. The faculty member who freely chooses one out of the five development programs in advance from a list he/she submits will really be "doing his/her own thing" and exercising freedom;

3. Faculty will be encouraged to "spontaneously" work on being kind and loving to their nearby neighbors, and to work on words and concepts that articulate this kind of truth;
4. In the face of change, in the face of progress, each faculty will be taught to tend his/her own needs, and to advance his/her own enlightenment and reward, along with being able to worry about those whom he/she does not see;
5. Attempt to create a relationship whereby a major change in the relationship between conservative faculty and liberal faculty will come about without a solemn confrontation of some form.

It is upon this basis, I believe that the whole notion of faculty development programs will depend. To the faculty, development carries the consoling message that there is no solemn need to stand up and take sides; faculty do not have to sustain; they do not have to subvert; faculty need to just stroll pleasantly through the process with an inductive glow. If there is a single phrase to summarize this notion, it is one like this: No one (even the most dedicated professor) needs to take sides. No one needs to put his or her body on the line. Faculty development does not need to be a counterfoil; it is sufficient if it constitutes an island or a kind of tranquility.

REFERENCES

Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development in Higher Education. Winter 1977-78.

Criteria Project, "Professional Development of Faculty," Issue No. IV, prepared at the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan, March, 1977.

Educational Development at Michigan State University, Report No. 9, Spring 1977, prepared and distributed by the Educational Development Program, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

"Faculty Development in Higher Education," Educational Horizons, Vol. 55, No. 2, Winter 1976-77, Pi Lamda Theta, 4101 East Third Street, Box A850, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

Gordon College Faculty Development Manual and Gordon College Faculty Development, The First Year, Dr. R. Judson Carlbery, Program Director, Gordon College, 255 Grapevine Road, Wenham, Massachusetts 01984.

A Handbook for Faculty Development, Volume 2, by William H. Berquist and Steven R. Phillips, Gary H. Quehl (Gen. Ed.), published by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Washington, D.C., January 1977.

Improving College Teaching: An Annotated Bibliography, prepared by Robert Webber and the Staff of the Change Magazine Undergraduate Teaching Project, August, 1976.

Kozma, R.B. "Learning and the Instructional System." New Directions for Higher Education, 1977, 17, 33-48.

Kozma, R.B. and Kulik, J.A. Manual for PSI Proctors. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.

Mager, R.F. Preparing Objectives for Programmed Instruction. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, Inc., 1962.

"Open Learning and Guidelines for the Design of Instructional Materials." The Journal of Technological Horizons in Education, January 1977.

Winter, Gibson. Being Free. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1970.